HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 34 Monday, August 25, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

ELECTIONS: *Three key battles*.....(page 1)

INTEGRATION: *Dixie's resentment grows*....(page 1)

LABOR: *The death of Kennedy-Ives*.....(page 2)

EDUCATION: *More on "guided minds"*.....(page 3)

HIGH COURT: *Finds a friend*.....(page 4)

On the Firing Line: As the fight for California's Governorship begins between Democrat Pat Brown and Senator William F. Knowland, one report by the grapevine has caused no little commotion in the Golden State. It is that the Mafia has spotted 18 cities throughout California as potentially profitable places to establish gambling houses; the report adds that the "boys" have already begun to "move in" in these areas. What the gangsters are counting on is a victory by Brown, whose "soft" policy in dealing with crime as state Attorney General has been the cause of much comment. Knowland launched an attack on this weakness of his opponent two weeks ago. It is expected that he will return to the theme in coming weeks.

● The drive for a right-to-work law in Ohio is expected to insure victory for the GOP ticket in November, strengthening weak candidates against Democratic opponents who denounce the proposed legislation. The right-to-work issue was swept onto a referendum ballot two weeks ago by a deluge of signatures—although the Republican high command, as well as Democrats and labor leaders, opposed it (see HUMAN EVENTS for June 30 and August 18, 1958). The state GOP leadership wanted to postpone such a referendum until 1959, when there would be no state-wide political campaign. They feared the power of the labor bosses, who have sworn death to the right to work.

Political experts in the Buckeye State now say that—such is the popular push behind right to work—the referendum may pull GOP Governor William O'Neill through. O'Neill, because of various mistakes in state politics, has been regarded as a weak candidate. Apparently the Republican strategists miscalculated, and now will get behind right to work, confident that its identification with the state ticket will produce a decisive victory in November.

● Way down south in Mississippi, a curious contest for a Congressional seat is shaping up in the Sixth District. Incumbent Congressman William M. Colmer, one of the most important conservative Democrats in the House of Representatives, is facing a fight for the seat from another conservative, Boyce Holeman. The power of the AFL-CIO is thrown behind the latter—for reasons probably not apparent to the voters of the District, but crystal clear to Capitol Hill in Washington.

Colmer is not only a staunch conservative, he is also a key man in the House organization. He is "next up to bat" on the list of Democratic members of the powerful House Rules Committee, the Chairman of which is the potent Representative Howard Smith. "Judge" Smith is 75 and might retire. By seniority, Colmer would succeed him—that is, if he were re-elected this year. The No. three man in seniority is Representative Ray Madden (D.-Ind.), a warm friend of the labor lobby. If Smith retired, and Colmer were defeated by his conservative opponent, Madden would become Chairman of the Rules Committee. Thus, labor would have a friend in one of the key spots of the legislative machinery in the House.* Not only labor lobbyists, but also conservatives, know what the precious stakes will be when the voters of the Sixth District go to the polls Tuesday, August 26.

In Memoriam: While the "liberal" columnists sought choice phrases to laud the closing session, Senator William E. Jenner (R.-Ind.), in an eloquent valedictory, intoned the true epitaph of the 85th Congress: "Nothing in the New Deal, nothing in World War II, and nothing in the postwar years or Korea, is anything like as outrageous as the spending spree of 1958. We have thrown away the hope of a balanced Budget for years to come."

And, as legislators divided their time between packing their bags and taking part in last-minute legislative battles, Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) also had words of chastisement for his big spending brethren. "We have appropriated and authorized the expenditure of enough money," he said, "to give this country in the approaching years its greatest peacetime deficit—a deficit estimated as high as $12 billion. . . .

> **"I want to remind my colleagues again, as I often have, that our enemies in Russia have for many years said they would destroy us by causing a collapse of our economy, and it seems to me, as we wind up this 85th Congress, that they are making better progress toward this means of ending our freedoms than they are making in the material field of weapons."**

Thunder Over the South: The appellate court decision against a delay in the integration of Little Rock high school, partially blunted by a subsequent stay of the court's order, has had explosive repercussions in Dixie. Word from correspondents in various Southern states runs to the effect that street-corner reactions of John Q. Public could not be printed, so angry were the people.

A cultivated, constitutional expression of Southern resentment appeared, August 19, in *The Richmond News-Leader*, a widely respected paper edited by James J.

* Although thousands of bills are introduced each year, and scores come out of committee, the House has time to vote on only a small number. The Rules Committee decides which bills get to the floor. The Rules chairman, by his power to call meetings and determine order of business, has a controlling influence. Watch for a forthcoming HUMAN EVENTS article dealing with this key committee.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. ● Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kilpatrick, author of *The Sovereign States* (Regnery), and a frequent contributor to HUMAN EVENTS (see "School Integration—Four Years After," May 12, 1958). The Richmond paper said: "In any other field of the law, a more temperate and judicious regard for the public interest would obtain. Time after time appellate courts have ruled that rights are not absolute. No person has an unqualified right of free speech or of the exercise of religion, or of assembly, or of peaceful possession of private property. Each of these individual rights is subject, in some degree, to the conflicting right of society as a whole. But in the segregation cases, the Federal appellate judges appear to be mesmerized by the single factor of race. The Circuit Court will ram these Negro plaintiffs down Little Rock's throat, and the public interest be damned."

Observers in the Capital, seeking to assay the long-term political results of the see-saw battle over Little Rock, believe that it forebodes a further split in the Democratic party and more serious consideration for the idea of building a separate Southern party, with a Southern Presidential candidate as the end product (see "A Southern President?" by John Synon, in HUMAN EVENTS for August 11, 1958). The trend of resistance in the South to the Supreme Court decisions will harden—according to all opinions from south of the Mason-Dixon line—with litigation of infinite complexity and stubbornness.

Labor Hoax Defeat: What killed the Kennedy-Ives "hoax" bill, which pretended to offer "moderate reform" of trade-union abuses? The answer given on both sides of Capitol Hill: the bill's own weakness, combined with the arrogance of the labor bosses and their legislative puppets in Congress.

The high-handed and unblushing manner with which the labor lobby moved in on the Senate and rammed the bill through startled many middle-of-the-roaders out of their complacency. The equally flagrant manipulation of House strategy roused Southern Democrats.

The labor bosses arranged with Speaker Rayburn—a willing instrument—to keep the bill from consideration by the critical and alert House Committee on Education and Labor, where the bosses feared that some teeth might be put into the measure. Finally, the Speaker's attempt to whisk the bill past in the last rush days of the session was too much for a number of Democrats who ordinarily are inclined to play along with their party leader. Revolt boiled over and the "hoax" was defeated.

The fact is that realization of what was billed by labor propagandists as a moderate step in "reform" had been spreading through the House side of Capitol Hill for some weeks. Articles like the HUMAN EVENTS piece of July 14 ("Why the Kennedy-Ives Bill Must Be Defeated," by James L. Wick) helped to illuminate its real character—bringing out such well-concealed facts as the following: (1) it set back labor reform 20 years by amending the Taft-Hartley Act, giving the right to vote in representation elections to economic strikers; and (2) it again scuttled Taft-Hartley defenses by narrowing the definition of "supervisors," allowing unions to absorb a number of managerial personnel.

Thus, instead of winning wider approval as a "moderate step" in the right direction, the bill loomed as a reversal of the labor reform trend which started with Taft-Hartley over ten years ago.

Finally, one conclusion—that Kennedy-Ives made a mockery of all the exposes of labor evils of the past two years—became inescapable. The following measures recommended by the McClellan Committee, based on long months of investigation, were not even in the bill: (1) permission for the states to act in labor disputes over which the Federal board had declined to assert jurisdiction; (2) failure to impose fiduciary responsibilities on union officers handling union funds; (3) denial to union members of the power to control their own affairs by means of democratically conducted elections.

Declaration of Independence: Senator William E. Jenner rocked the Capital last week with an act unprecedented in the memory of Washington's most grizzled veterans. The fiery Hoosier declared that his state wanted no part of the ersatz "National Defense" education bill then being bulled through the Senate, and introduced an amendment specifically excluding Indiana from its alleged "benefits." His act was acclaimed by the citizens and the press of his state.

A few days later, Jenner offered legislation to provide that, in cases where a state chooses not to participate in Federal aid programs, "its share will be returned by the Federal Treasury to the state, to be spent as the state legislature directs." The House-Senate conference on the education bill subsequently eliminated the Jenner amendment. One possible reason for their action, speculate Capitol staffers following the legislation, was the sudden "liberal" realization that a self-reliant Indiana might prove the bellwether in a march away from Federal aid programs.

In attacking the education bill, Jenner called attention to the curious provisions of Title VIII, stipulating that in the apportionment of funds for "language development" studies, "the Commissioner shall give 'priority' to contracts for 'the Middle East, Africa or Asia (including the Soviet Union).'"

"Here is a beautiful plan," he commented, "for deluging our schools with courses on Soviet institutions and filling up the remaining time with information about the 'uncommitted areas' of Asia and Africa which are the darlings of our State Department . . . The people of Indiana believe our students should get much less propagandizing about the might and achievements of the Soviet Union and a great deal more solid instruction in American history, American government, and the American economic system."

- In showing why Indiana had no need for Federal patronage, Jenner alluded to a recent study conducted by an Indiana Board of Education Committee, designed to find out how many qualified students were prevented from pursuing college math and science studies by financial need. The study unearthed only 53 qualified high school graduates desiring to go on to college who were in need of such aid; all of these are now being supplied by private sources.

- A related case of local sources providing adequate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

educational opportunities occurred recently in Fall River, Massachusetts. Last spring, the city's Citizen Scholarship Foundation canvassed this industrial town, selling "memberships" and signing up 4,000 individuals. Most members paid only $1 each, with some contributing larger amounts. As a result, some 24 seniors from Fall River high schools were given scholarships ranging from $50 to $300 each. Fall River hopes to expand its program next year, and already other communities have shown an interest in this successful program.

Guided Minds: Glossed over in the controversy concerning the Federal-aid-to-education bill was the stinging attack launched by Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) against Title VII of the legislation, which provided Federal funds for "testing, guidance and counseling." (See "Guided Minds: The Promise and the Threat," by Emily Cuyler Hammond, in HUMAN EVENTS for June 9, 1958.)

Goldwater read into the *Congressional Record* an entire list of questions from one of the "personality inventory" sheets designed by the testing and guidance advocates. Included were such items as: "I don't have enough things to play with"; "I wish we had a nice house"; "I don't like my home"; "I wish I didn't have a brother"; "Sometimes I wish I was dead"; "My home is too dirty"; "I am afraid of my mother"; "I am afraid of my daddy"; "I have sores between my toes."

Goldwater also quoted a number of questions from the Science Research Youth Inventory and from the "Mooney Problem Check." Throughout these lists of questions, those who read the Goldwater insertions and who are otherwise familiar with the testers' concoctions note a constant emphasis, as in the statements quoted above, on the idea of parent-child conflict. Many of the questions seem designed to generate hostility between parents and children. Here are some other parent-children quotations: "my mother is too bossy"; "my mother and daddy often fight"; "my daddy treats me like a little kid"; "my daddy won't help me"; "I have to do too much work at home"; "I'm sometimes ashamed of my family." Such items as these are included in the "Mooney Problem Check": "family quarrels"; "wanting to run away from home"; "want things my parents can't give me"; "my parents are too strict"; "I feel there is a barrier between myself and my parents"; "my allowance is too small"; "my parents don't respect my opinions."

Such an approach, note opponents of "guidance" techniques, could dovetail perfectly with an attempt by the educationists to wean children away from their parents and to put them under state control.

Goldwater told the Senate: "I do not want the Federal Government counseling my children. I do not want my own state counseling my children. That is the job of American parents and American churches. Have we gone so far down the ladder on rubbery legs that we are frightened to death by Russia and must say to the parents of the country, 'Do not bother with your children. We are going to take them over. We will tell them what to study and what we want them to do, and how to do it. You keep on drinking your beer and watching television'? If so, this country is going to pot in a Cadillac, and not in a chariot, as happened in the days of Rome."

● Senator Carl Curtis (R.-Neb.), rising to support Goldwater's argument against Title VII, quoted two passages from members of the clergy, as printed in HUMAN EVENTS for June 16, 1958, in opposition to testing and guidance schemes. Goldwater commented: "Usually one says, 'you took the words right out of my mouth,' but the Senator from Nebraska took the slip right off my page . . . "

Pork Barrel: Pointed out as an example of how far removed this session's "pork barreling" has been from the true temper of the American people are statistics on voter behavior at the local level, where funds are more directly controlled by the people who must foot the bills. In bond issues for building schools, for example, taxpayers at the local level have been casting vehement ballots in favor of economy. A recent article in the Pittsburgh *Sun-Telegraph,* by James F. McCarthy, discloses:

> **"In November, 1956, citizens were asked to approve school bond issues totaling $448 million. They passed $423 million or all but 5.6 per cent. A year later school boards asked public approval of $231.8 million in new school bonds and the people said yes on $148.8 million. The rejection rate had climbed to 35.8 per cent."**

McCarthy explained: "Today, more than ever before, voters know what an interest rate means. Interest on a typical district school bond has risen from 2.17 per cent in 1951 to 3.22 per cent as of March . . . This is expensive debt service and the public knows it." Property owners, McCarthy concluded, are fuming at their rising tax rates. "Research has established that most people must save in advance to pay these taxes, dip into savings, or borrow."

If such a wave of economy is manifest at the grassroots level, it is asked, how will the voters react to the "squanderbund" of "liberal" Congressmen who must seek re-election on their big spending records this fall?

'Arab Nationalism': Contradicting the theory that the machinations of Egypt's Colonel Nasser represent the spontaneous eruptions of "Arab nationalism" is a recent report from the Paris headquarters of NATO, entitled "The Communist Drive Into Africa." This study points up the key role being played by Egypt, land bridge between Asia and Africa, in the Red drive for world domination.

"Colonel Nasser's anti-Western policies," states the report, "have forced Egypt into increased dependence on the Soviet bloc economy. It is notable that during the first ten months of 1957, the Soviet Union was Egypt's main trading partner, China was second and Czechoslovakia third."

The Communists, it continues, "have gained influence over a professedly anti-Communist regime, have infiltrated a large number of technicians and teachers into the country, and now have a full-fledged front organization—the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Council—based in Cairo."

Nasser, the study concludes, has no reason to misunderstand the dangerous game he is playing. "The Afro-Asian conference [at Cairo eight months ago] has perhaps done more than any other single event to show

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him the dangers into which he is running. He can have no doubt about Soviet support for the conference—even if Soviet sponsorship of it was successfully disguised."

Business in Politics: Representative Ralph Harvey (R.-Ind.) called attention last week to a recent article in the Muncie, Indiana, *Press*, written by John W. Fisher, vice president of the Ball Bros. glass company. Fisher explained why businessmen should take an interest in politics and how they should go about it.

"Many business decisions," he wrote, "are made in legislative halls or by governmental bureaus. Believe it or not, unemployment compensation regulations may dictate seasonal operations. Actually, we have been forced to deprive the Muncie area of employment opportunities at times because it was not economically feasible to operate for a matter of one or two months and then have to pay stiff unemployment benefits . . . Unless we are fully familiar with and interested in such legislation through our political representatives, then we do not have an opportunity to voice our opinions . . . "

Fisher added: "Politics begin at the precinct level. I am sure many businessmen and others in this community never take an interest in this political fact. Unless you have enthusiastic and responsible precinct committeemen, you will not have an effective county chairman or cooperation with your state and national officials."

Internal Security: As the House voted last week to cite textile manufacturer Bernard Goldfine for contempt of Congress, a less heralded, but highly significant, contempt action was also making its way through the lower Chamber. By a vote of 365 to 1, the House voted to initiate contempt proceedings against Carl Braden, of Louisville, Kentucky. The issue at stake: whether Braden could refuse to answer questions put to him by the House Un-American Activities Committee on the grounds that they were "not pertinent" and that "the mandate of this committee is so vague that nobody knows what you are supposed to be investigating." Involved is the scope of the Supreme Court's *Watkins* decision, handed down in June of 1957, stating that witnesses must be instructed as to the pertinency of questions put to them (Braden was told this about the questions asked him).

Braden was convicted of sedition by the state of Kentucky three years ago. At the time of his trial, he was ardently defended by left-wing elements in the press, principally by the ultra-"liberal" Louisville *Courier-Journal*, for which he worked. It was asserted that there was no evidence that Braden was a Communist, and that he was being harassed by "witch hunters." But in the House testimony for which Braden was cited for contempt, he was given an opportunity to deny sworn testimony that he had been a member of the Communist party. He refused to do so, on the grounds that "you are probing into private beliefs and associations, which are protected by the First Amendment of the United States."

Although convicted of seditious activity, Braden is a free man today because of the Supreme Court's decision in the *Nelson* case, overturning state sedition laws. Legislation seeking to correct that decision was turned back by the margin of one vote on a Senate roll call last week. The House hearings brought out that Braden, in his "field secretary" position for the "Southern Conference Educational Fund," has been battling passage of such bills. A letter sent out by him stated that "there are now pending in both Houses of Congress bills that would nullify [the *Nelson* decision]. We understand that there is real danger that these bills will pass." The letter asks recipients to "stand firm against all efforts to curb the Supreme Court."

Committee Staff Director Richard Arens asked Braden: "Were you a member of the Communist party the instant you affixed your signature to that letter?" Braden's answer: "I refuse to answer on the same ground previously stated, Mr. Chairman."

● The Braden byplay, say advocates of legislation to limit the Supreme Court, shows how feverishly the Communists and their friends worked this session to stop corrective legislation aimed at the rampaging Court.

Between Covers: The Summer, 1958 issue of *Free World Review*, a quarterly journal which takes a strongly anti-Communist position on foreign affairs, contains a full-length article on the experiences of Vice President Nixon during his trip to South America. The article, by Jorge Romano of Buenos Aires, offers an explanation of Nixon's ordeal contrary to "liberal" propagandizing on that subject. The Communists were able to fan the flames of anti-US feeling, says Romano, because of America's "soft" policy towards communism, which has failed to impress Latin Americans with the dangers of communism, or to capture their sympathies for the US. "The soft American approach," says the author, "appealing to reason rather than emotion, cannot match the ruthless and unscrupulous Soviet propaganda which knows that a moderate and sophisticated approach is easily misinterpreted here as weakness."

The article concludes by noting that "it was not a psychological blunder at all to send some USA units to the Caribbean [at the time of the Nixon incident]. A firm attitude and a show of force never hurt the prestige of a country, especially when it is dealing with younger and less mature nations."

Copies of this issue of *Free World Review* may be obtained by sending $1 to PO Box 1254, New York 8, N. Y. Subscriptions: $4 annually.

C. D. BATCHELOR, Pultizer Prize-winning cartoonist for the New York Daily News: "HUMAN EVENTS—so right, so compact, so necessary to an understanding of the course of our Nation's Government and misgovernment."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 34 HUMAN EVENTS August 25, 1958

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

THE SECRET OF POLITICAL SUCCESS

How to Convert the Unconverted

By ELIZABETH CHURCHILL BROWN

"THE DANGER ARISES NOT FROM THE OBJECTIVE BUT FROM THE INCORRECT STRATEGY FOR ACHIEVING THE CORRECT OBJECTIVE . . . In politics, as in war, when a direct attack is too costly it is frequently advisable, and no less effective, to utilize a flank attack."

These are the words of Andrew Roth, in his book, *Dilemma in Japan,* which contains numerous helpful pointers for fellow travellers and others of the Moscow-lining ilk, as to the best means of achieving their goals. The emphasis is his own. (Roth was arrested with John Stewart Service and four others in the famous Red espionage case revolving around *Amerasia* magazine.)

The greatest weakness of American conservatives is their lack of strategy. They seldom deviate from the "direct attack." And the attack seldom varies in its pattern of "clobber 'em," "expose 'em," "hit 'em." By " 'em," of course, is meant the Communists, fellow travellers and "liberal" dupes. A mosquito biting an elephant has as much effect.

The conservative aim should be to convert the non-Communist into an anti-Communist. It is the conservative's only hope of winning. The shotgun tactics used against the enemy all too often hit the confused middle-of-the-roader as well. The small shot have no effect on the hide of the enemy, but they sting the propagandized non-Communist into such a fury that he inadvertently backs into the waiting arms of the Communists and their followers.

We are losing the fight for the simple reason that while the Communists study and work at strategy in persuading the non-Communists to dance to their tunes, the right has used no strategy at all.

The McCarthy issue offers a case study in the do's and don'ts of successful strategy. At the outset, the Communists made the blunder of their lives in attacking McCarthy instead of ignoring him. They then found themselves making a hero out of him. There was no conservative leadership to take advantage of the enemy's error. But the enemy, recognizing the mistake immediately, went into a huddle to plan the destruction of McCarthy in the shortest time possible. When this had been accomplished by the Senate's passage of the condemnation resolution, orders went out that McCarthy was never to be mentioned in the press again. The now-deceased *Daily Worker,* which carried an attack on the Senator on almost every page daily for five years, suddenly omitted him entirely. Much of the Nation's press mysteriously followed the example.

Meanwhile, the conservatives proceeded to let nature take its course, doing no more than venting their emotions. They were unable to halt the onslaught of the anti-McCarthy forces.

The first rule of successful political strategy is to KNOW your facts. McCarthyites sometimes made the mistake of not knowing enough about the Senator's fight. At times they even believed the Communist slander themselves. I have often heard someone attempting to justify the "naming of names" by McCarthy. How many people remember that in his first speeches concerning Communists in the State Department, McCarthy pointedly gave only case histories, citing each by a number instead of by a name?

Who remembers that the Democratic Leader, Senator Scott Lucas, as well as a number of other Senators, demanded that the names be given to the Senate body then and there? Or that Senator McCarthy replied that each accused person should have the right to defend himself in a private hearing where it would be possible to clear himself?

AFTER MCCARTHY'S initial charges, the Communist party line was to smear him for withholding information from the Senate. Soon the public in general was parroting the slander. McCarthy's demands for a closed hearing were seldom reported and soon forgotten. When a Senate committee was set up to investigate McCarthy's charges, its chairman, Millard Tydings, astounded all concerned when he ruled that the hearings would be open, thus giving none of the suspected a chance to clear themselves privately. McCarthy was obliged to name the cases in public. The Communist line immediately switched to accusing him of character assassination. The smear still sticks. To this day, too few people—even among the Senator's supporters—know these early facts, which make a powerful and persuasive argument in the ears of the ill-informed non-Communist.

The second important rule is to practice the gentle art of persuasion. In the event that a person happened to be well informed on the McCarthy name business, his information would do little good if he proceeded to ram it down the throat of his listener, insinuating that those not knowing such facts were of sub-par intelligence.

Honey attracts more bees than vinegar, as granny used to say, and a simple, humble approach (the

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flank attack)—letting the listener realize that you did not know all these facts by some God-given genius—can at once form a sympathetic bond: I did not know this or that until I "just happened across it," or until I read it in such-and-such an authoritative book. To argue pleasantly and persuasively, to ask questions, to listen to the other side, is an art worth learning.

Persuasive argument requires practice in expressing oneself clearly, and, if possible, strikingly. A look at the great religious leaders in world history discloses the means by which they were able to make millions of converts. Christ used parables to explain his meanings. We too can use parables and analogies to cut through the leftists' propaganda.

What, for instance, would the American public have said in 1939, during the "cold war," if our Government had signed a "cultural exchange" agreement with Nazi Germany? What would they have said if the United States had been sending economic and military aid to Mussolini before his "stab in the back" against France? What would their reaction have been if the German ballet, or some similar group, had been invited to tour our Nation while Hitler was persecuting the Jews?

A good example of the "flank" or parable approach was supplied by W. F. Peterson, a prominent businessman of Baltimore, when he wrote to a local paper concerning the recent controversial rulings of the Supreme Court. He drew the reader back to the early days of our history and asked: What would the Continental Congress have done if the Supreme Court had ruled that Tory teachers could not be fired by local school boards, or that the Government could not fire Tory employees unless they were in sensitive positions?

While there are many businessmen like Peterson who see the danger and take steps to neutralize it, other businessmen have shown that political matters can be badly mishandled if sufficient know-how is lacking. There are many who see the danger but who do not know how to go about fighting it. Some have made a stab at it and badly burned their fingers by trusting the ability of the wrong people, or having gone at it lone-wolf fashion without sufficient knowledge of the fight or of the enemy.

I recall one financier, for example, who decided that the best way to contribute to the cause was to buy an influential newspaper and to publish the unvarnished truth. His naivete in the publishing business was only surpassed by his ignorance of the conspiracy. In no time at all both the paper and he were bankrupt.

Other offenders in conservatism's history of bad strategy include some of the speakers appearing before politically mixed audiences. I have sat in an audience composed of conservatives as well as the politically confused and seen the latter politely repelled at what they heard. They were, for the most part, people who sensed that something was radically wrong with our national affairs, but who were unable to bring themselves to place the blame on those leaders in whom they had put their trust. The speaker took no consideration of this element and proceeded to blast our statesmen in a most insulting manner—leaving no doubt that he considered those who did not share his views as dolts and fools. The net result was that he antagonized what had been prospective converts. They left the hall angry. On this particular occasion I know that some resigned as members of the organization.

But added to this bad mistake, the speaker made one or two statements which could easily be (and were) misinterpreted by a hostile press. The following day the newspapers carried stories which made both the organization and the speaker appear in a bad light. The recipients of the bad press were wailing about the unfair, biased and slanted newspapers. But they had only themselves to blame. It is futile to denounce a match for burning your finger.

CONTRARY TO ALL this, let us see how the "opposition" proceeds with its rallies and meetings. Jesus Colon, writing in the *Daily Worker* last summer, recalled hearing Eugene Debs speak during the early days of the Communist party in America. Debs, he said, made an "emotional impact" on the audience — of mixed political sympathies — and caused "tremendous enthusiasm." " . . . he entered into a political analysis of each issue simply and understandably so that his listeners could follow him."

Colon goes on to describe how Debs spoke of the Socialist dream of abundance, justice and "the wiping out of hunger and wars." "He continued to talk of all these things in the affirmative," Colon wrote. "There is nothing wrong in 'dreaming' provided that your 'dreams' have a basis in reality . . . providing that you are willing to back up your dreams with sweat and action and blood if necessary in order to make it real."

How many speakers do we have who have placed a dream before an audience and caused them to leave the hall consumed with the desire to "back up their dreams with sweat and action and blood if necessary"? How many of our speakers go out before an audience asking themselves: "What can I say to make converts?" Every speaker should bear in mind that he already has a "man on first base" because, politically confused or not, every person in the audience is a patriotic American. Give them the facts, inspire them, and they will set out to defend their country.

Two things a speaker must remember. He must first divest himself of the privilege of "saying anything I damn please." It is the audience that must be pleased. The speaker should talk calmly as well as forcefully, and not indulge in the pleasure of showing outrage at what he is saying. He must give the audience the facts tactfully, and permit *them* to feel the outrage—giving them the opportunity to come to their own conclusions.

Secondly, the speaker must know his subject thoroughly. How often have I winced when I realized

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a speaker had been too careless in his study of his subject, or too biased to give all the facts and sometimes made outright errors. Not only should his audience not be misinformed, but such errors are liable to be picked up by a hostile press.

* * *

Now let us talk of the activities of organizations and clubs. What action do they take and what strategy do they use? If they had to make monthly or even yearly reports, what could they say they had accomplished? How many organizations actually attempt to bring in new converts? How many have serious study groups where members take time from their bridge games and parties to learn? How many have letter-writing campaigns to local editors, members of Congress, and radio and TV sponsors?

If your organization has not made a report on its past activities, now is the time to make one. Looking backward you can see what needs to be done. And now is the time to start strategy meetings.

In order to bring converts into your group, what do you have to offer them? The Communists try to give prospective members a good time as well as work. They seek out the lonely and give them a sense of "belonging" and give them a chance to make friends. They have dances and picnics, inspiring speakers, and *work that brings satisfaction.* The last-named attraction is an asset which will draw recruits from all directions.

Strategy meetings should discuss the ways and means of letter writing—one of the most powerful weapons available to citizens' groups. In writing letters, it is important to follow the correct approach. If you should be disturbed at what you believe to be a false statement made by an official, do not write him an angry letter full of statements of fact. He will simply reply with a polite thank-you note. Instead, assume that either he or you may be mistaken, and ask him questions. He will undoubtedly write you a full and informative letter.

An error too often committed by some patriotic organizations is the practice of sending out bulletins for no other purpose than to get something off their chests. Mailing bulletins is a costly project and every mailing should have a specific goal: notice of meetings or important information *on which letter writing is urged.*

An important function of patriotic groups is to see that their members also belong to other organzations. It is important because conservatives should belong to P-TAs and be active in church groups, garden clubs, Leagues of Women Voters, YMCAs, YWCAs, *etc.* They should not only be active in such groups but should be well enough informed so that when they hear speakers who may be giving out misinformation, their carefully phrased questions during the question period can set the audience straight. DON'T join these groups in order to raise a rumpus, but for the purpose of winning friends and influencing people.

Again, let us refer to the successful tactics of the enemy. In 1944, Earl Browder, then head of the Communist party USA, wrote a book called *Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace.* His main theme was the Communists' blueprint for foreign aid. Declaring that Americans must "expand their concept of the foreign market by a thousand per cent," he proceeded to sketch the outlines of a gigantic foreign-aid project. He wrote:

> The most serious obstacle to the realization of the need of a huge foreign market is the dogma that prohibits the Government from exercising any major role in economic affairs. Once it is accepted that the United States Government should play as bold a role in securing foreign markets as it is playing in winning a foreign war, then the problem would look entirely different . . .

This daring project had to be merchandised carefully if it was to be successful. Browder pointed the direction of the flank attack.

> [this economic program] must find a point of common interest of the different classes involved in national unity, and build from that point. This method will win a maximum of agreement, and rouse a minimum of opposition, from the various groups and classes, among which the chief role is played by the businessmen (industrial and financial capitalists and their managers) and the working classes (industrial labor and farmers) . . . Once it is approached as a national task, in the national interest, the problem will yield to the combined intellectual power of the country.

One can almost see the directive sent by the Politburo to guide Browder's actions: 1. obstacle to be overcome—the dogma which prohibits Government from interfering in free enterprise; 2. the approach—to be based on a national task in the national interest; look for a point of common interest in all classes.

THE FIRST TO BE approached with the patriotic slogan of "national task, national interest," were the very men the Communists aim ultimately to destroy, American businessmen. Emphasizing the Communists' ability to turn their coats inside-out when the occasion requires it, Browder stated: "we declare in advance our understanding that the democratic-progressive camp to which we adhere will adopt the defense of 'free enterprise,' that we understand this term as a synonym for capitalism as it exists in our country, and that we will not oppose it or put forth any counter-slogans."

Browder's proposal, finally, was to "create a series of giant industrial development corporations, each in partnership with some other government or group of governments, and set them to work upon large-scale plans of railroad and highway building, agricultural and industrial development, and all-round modernization in all the devastated and undeveloped areas of the world . . ." (The domestic policy to accompany this program included "large-scale Government policies of educational, health, and general environmental improvement, including the whole gamut of social insurance features.") The book goes into great detail concerning how and where our money was to be spent.

The fantastic success of Browder's foreign-aid blueprint of 1944 goes without saying. Even today we hear the approach of "national task, national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interest" used to propagandize the hesitant. Many American businessmen fully believe that in backing indiscriminate foreign aid they are contributing to the Nation's interest while at the same time holding on to free enterprise. The Communists have mastered the task of making friends and influencing big business people.

* * *

Someone once asked me why "our side" is never able to raise money for our cause. My reply was that intelligent planning begets money. Businessmen in this arena approach the fight in a haphazard manner which they would never dream of using in business. On the other hand, I have listened to a successful publisher discuss the best way to lure subscribers to his publication. Do they like to read this? Or do they like to read that? What kind of people are we aiming at? I didn't hear him say: "I want to publish such-and-such a story and if they don't like it they can lump it."

I've heard businessmen sit down and plan a promotional campaign with infinite care. I've watched TV commercials and thought that if business firms can sell cigarettes to the American public, surely—if they put their minds, determination, and time to it—they could sell the public on the Nation's urgent need for vigorous anti-Communist action.

It would pay America's capitalists to hire experts to teach them how to fight carefully, intelligently, unobtrusively—to "utilize the flank attack." There are many former Communists as well as students of the conspiracy who are at present eking out a living as best they can and contributing to the fight in small ways. But, being experts in the conspiracy, they know the pitfalls by heart and take a long, hard look at any proposed project which may ask their services.

ANOTHER DETERRENT to effective conservative action is what Roosevelt used to call the "lunatic fringe"—the crackpots. They consist mostly of people who so thoroughly enjoy their feelings of outrage that they resent any suggestion that they curb their activities or utilize their intelligence. They prefer to blame most, if not all, of their troubles on the Jews and Negroes. Communists and other leftists, holding up the crackpots as Exhibit A to the middle-of-the-roaders, use them for the purpose of labelling all conservatives as somehow unbalanced.

Nothing is quite so effective in cancelling out constructive anti-Communist work as the label of anti-Semitism or racism. And the Communists are successfully using this weapon. One of their favorite tricks in tarring a patriotic organization is to obtain the unwitting services of an anti-Semite to pass out anti-Semitic literature during a meeting. In one instance I am familiar with, the president of the organization, wise to these tactics, ruled against the distribution of any literature she had not first read. Much to her consternation, she found that the literature was handed out as the members left, outside the meeting hall.

It is extremely important for active anti-Communists to stay away from anti-Semites and racial agitators and to know who they are. The name of one anti-Semite on the letterhead and an organization is tarred.

Another grave fault of the conservatives is that they always want the whole loaf or nothing. "No compromise" is their righteous slogan. On the other hand, the Communists are grateful if they only gain a crumb. They know that one crumb added to another will eventually make a whole loaf. At election time, if conservatives have a choice of a middle-of-the-roader and a leftist, many of them stay away from the polls. But if a Communist has a choice between a middle-of-the-roader and a conservative, he will vote for the former. On the other hand, if by chance the conservative candidate should have been obliged to make a compromise vote in the House or Senate, he will lose many conservative votes. The result is that the United States Congress is filling up with leftists and confused middle-of-the-roaders—a slow but sure victory for the Communists.

Let every man and women do some hard, candid thinking. We should ask ourselves these questions:

1. Are we being ignored by the left? If so, we (or our organization) are not effective.
2. Are we being made fun of by the left? If so, we are making some pretty stupid mistakes.
3. Are we being attacked by the left? If so, we are doing effective work and beginning to draw blood.

Perhaps if the answer to the last question is "yes," a fourth should follow: What can we do to go on to even more effective work?

"Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak and slow to wrath." Thus wrote St. James.

Elizabeth Churchill Brown, former newspaperwoman and author of *The Enemy at His Back*, is the wife of syndicated columnist Constantine Brown. Her most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "Woman's Place is Under the Dome," January 13, 1958.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE SECRET OF POLITICAL SUCCESS" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED